## Message

From: Sinks, Tom [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=001007B7D256453A8A19B91DF704E22C-SINKS, TOM]

**Sent**: 6/1/2018 2:02:41 PM

To: Staff\_OSA [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=be69b6688a614ca39759d52ca5716ef3-OSA]

Subject: RE: Concern about Secret Science - FW: Form submission from: Stationary Sources of Air Pollution Contact Us About

Stationary Sources of Air Pollution form

I think the regular response would be fine

From: Staff\_OSA

**Sent:** Friday, June 01, 2018 10:01 AM **To:** Sinks, Tom <Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: Concern about Secret Science - FW: Form submission from: Stationary Sources of Air Pollution Contact Us

About Stationary Sources of Air Pollution form

Someone submitted their comments on the Transparency rule to an OAR website. I will forward this to the docket. Do you want any sort of reply to the person who submitted the comments?

Cheryl A. Hawkins, Ph.D.
US EPA/ORD/Office of the Science Advisor
RRB 41259
(202)564-7307
hawkins.cheryla@epa.gov

From: AirAction

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 30, 2018 1:07 PM **To:** Staff\_OSA < Staff\_OSA@epa.gov>

Subject: Fw: Concern about Secret Science - FW: Form submission from: Stationary Sources of Air Pollution Contact Us

About Stationary Sources of Air Pollution form

Forwarding this inquiry that was submitted via an OAR website about stationary sources and air pollution and appears to be about the proposed rule titled, "Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science."

Thank you.

----Original Message----

From: drupal\_admin@epa.gov [mailto:drupal\_admin@epa.gov] On Behalf Of Sue Miller via EPA

Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 10:02 AM

Subject: Form submission from: Stationary Sources of Air Pollution Contact Us About Stationary Sources of Air Pollution

form

Submitted on 04/25/2018 10:01AM

Submitted values are:

Name: Sue Miller

Email Address: Personal Email / Ex. 6

Comments:

I understand there is a proposed rule change which would, in part, eliminate the confidentiality of test subjects. It's pretty obvious no one wants their individual personal data available for public scrutiny. And it's also obvious this rule is attempting to dial back air pollution standards by eliminating landmark research. This rule change needs to go away. I'm old enough to remember when our cities' air were filled with smog. It was awful.